



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXL.

MARCH, 1909.

THE CHURCH AND THE REPUBLIC.

BY HIS EMINENCE, CARDINAL GIBBONS.

I.

FIFTEEN millions of Catholics live their lives in our land with undisturbed belief in the perfect harmony existing between their religion and their duties as American citizens. It never occurs to their minds to question the truth of a belief which all their experience confirms. Love of religion and love of country burn together in their hearts. They love their Church as the divine spiritual society set up by Jesus Christ, through which they are brought into a closer communion with God, learn His revealed truth and His holy law, receive the help they need to lead Christian lives and are inspired with the hope of eternal happiness. They love their country with the spontaneous and ardent love of all patriots, because it is their country and the source to them of untold blessings. They prefer its form of government before any other. They admire its institutions and the spirit of its laws. They accept the Constitution without reserve, with no desire, as Catholics, to see it changed in any feature. They can with a clear conscience swear to uphold it.

With an appreciation, the greater because their fathers or they themselves have known persecution,—in the British Isles, in Ger-

many, in Poland and elsewhere,—they prize both the liberty they enjoy as citizens and the liberty assured to the Church. The separation of Church and State in this country seems to them the natural, inevitable and best conceivable plan, the one that would work best among us, both for the good of religion and of the State. Any change in their relations they would contemplate with dread. They are well aware, indeed, that the Church here enjoys a larger liberty and a more secure position than in any country to-day where Church and State are united. They have a deep distrust and strong dislike of the intermeddling of the State with the concerns of religion: and such a restriction as the Church was obliged to endure in France, binding the Pope to choose Catholic bishops only from among the candidates presented to him by unbelieving Government officials, seems to them,—not fully appreciating the difficulties of the situation,—a scandal and a shame. They most assuredly desire never to see a like system introduced into the governing of the Church in America. No establishment of religion is being dreamed of here, of course, by any one; but, were it to be attempted, it would meet with the united opposition of the Catholic people, priests and prelates.

Catholics feel at home among their countrymen. They are conscious of an unstained record of loyalty, of patriotic self-sacrifice and of law-abiding behavior. Their dearest ambition is to live in peace with all, to antagonize no class; they are conscious of no barrier separating them more than any other element of the population into a class apart. Strong in the knowledge that an overwhelming majority of their fellow-citizens understand and appreciate them, they usually ignore the occasional insults directed to them by a small and rapidly decreasing section of the community not yet emancipated from ancestral misconception and prejudices, and still wedded to the conviction that the Gospel is to be propagated by slander and the fomentation of religious strife.

This form of religious propaganda Catholics know to be abhorrent to the spirit of every true American; and on that spirit they rely to nullify the spasmodic efforts of bigotry; for, though a large proportion of the non-Catholics do not sympathize with Catholic doctrines, this dissent is not carried over into political or social life. Men have learned in this country to disagree pro-

foundly without rancor or bitterness. With no compromise of principle on either side, moral worth, sterling character, kindly qualities of mind and heart bind together in good-will, admiration and friendship the lives of those who do not worship at the same altar. The non-Catholic American would receive with a contemptuous smile or an indignant gesture any suggestion that his Catholic friend, or business associate, carried hidden in his heart some sinister tenet that gave the lie to his life, and might at any moment oblige him to turn traitor to the Republic.

The Catholic himself feels, as he has learned from the lips of his own revered and trusted teachers of religion, that the more faithful he is to his religion the better and nobler citizen will he be. That religion and patriotism could ever come into conflict in his bosom seems to him an utter impossibility; and in the religious principles which he has received in common with his fellow Catholics he sees the surest defence of the State against the forces of disorder and lawlessness, and the insidious influences that work for the overthrow of our Christian moral standards in private and public life.

Such are the conditions that exist, in themselves admirable, and gratifying to the statesman, to the churchman, to the lover of religion and country; to all who rejoice in the spread of good-will and peace among men. Who would dare to introduce religious strife among us, to disturb this peace, and set the torch to the Temple of Concord?

II.

Of this body of American citizens living such a life and imbued with such sentiments (of which there are almost as many proofs as there are Catholics), two synods of Protestant ministers have deemed it just and wise to proclaim to the country that Catholics cannot be trusted with political office; that they cannot sincerely subscribe to the Federal Constitution; that their loyalty is illogical, being contrary to the teaching of the Church; that their religion is opposed to American liberties; and that they themselves, kept in the dark by their religious guides, are ignorant of the true nature of their Church's doctrines. In sounding forth these charges to American Catholics and to the country in general, they declare themselves inspired, not by religious

antagonism or the desire to profit by a good opportunity, but solely by patriotic solicitude for the permanence of American institutions.

Charges so contrary to the abiding convictions of American Catholics and so hurtful to their deepest affections are naturally resented; yet they do not appear to have excited any commotion among us. It would indeed be a grave matter if these utterances expressed the judgment of the American nation, indicated its sentiments towards our Catholic citizens and preluded a departure from the national policy of religious liberty and equality before the law. Happily, we know this is very far from the fact. The truth is, we believe, these ministers not only do not represent the American attitude towards us, but would meet with determined opposition if they attempted to carry with them even their own congregations. They have good cause to complain, as they do, of the apathy of their co-religionists. Catholics are convinced that the nation recognizes its own voice in President Roosevelt's letter to Mr. J. C. Martin rather than in the pronouncements it provoked. There they hear the ring of genuine Americanism; and they catch in the other the echo of old cries, of which they have long grown weary.

III.

It can be pleasant to none of us to be called upon, not only to prove our title to convictions which have guided us through life, but to show cause why we should not be deprived of the common political rights of human beings in our own native land. However, I feel obliged to speak out; and if I should speak with warmth on one or two points, it will be because I feel the proposal made deserves the strongest reprobation and is, moreover, entirely unworthy of men in the position of those from whom it emanated. I have no desire to inflict pain, but I cannot avoid characterizing the action of the synods as it deserves. Against the gentlemen themselves I can feel no animosity. They are excellent men in many respects, no doubt, and mean to be good citizens. I am sure, though their spirit does not tend to sweeten American life as much as we might desire, they help to purify and raise its tone, and to keep religion alive in the hearts of their people, and I can only wish them well.

The Catholic religion, as they understand it, is in conflict with the Federal Constitution, and with the object of our institutions. Catholics, then, ought not to be trusted with political office. Accordingly, Americans should seek to exclude Catholics from the chair of the President who is called upon to enforce the Constitution; from the Supreme Bench, whose duty it is to interpret it; from the Senate and the House of Representatives, which have the power to change it. And as the chief evil dreaded from Catholics is a modification of the existing relations between Church and State, a power theoretically reserved to our State Governments, no Catholic should be chosen Governor, State legislator or judge of a supreme State court. This is the scope of their meaning, though not all explicitly avowed. It would logically be desirable to deny Catholics the right to vote, and with men in the frame of mind their attitude suggests, the realization of this desire in the statute-books, and of their complete programme, would only be a matter of their possessing sufficient power and judging the act politically expedient.

Now this proposal to exclude Catholics from office,—for it is no mere theory, but a practical programme earnestly recommended to the American public by two solemn assemblies,—is advocated expressly in the interest of religious liberty and for the sake of preserving the Federal Constitution. That document says: “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.” Just understand here, however, remark these Lutheran and Baptist synods, an amendment or rather, let us say, a little clause which brings out the sense with admirable clearness: “provided, of course, that this provision be not understood to apply to Roman Catholics.”

Such restrictions on religion have always been felt to be incompatible with American ideas and have fallen, though sometimes only after a long struggle, before the force of the real American spirit. “When the Constitution came before the State conventions, . . . in Massachusetts alone was a dread of liberty expressed. Major Lusk ‘shuddered at the idea that Roman Catholics, Papists and Pagans might be introduced into office, and that Popery and the Inquisition may be established in America.’ ‘Who,’ answered the Rev. Mr. Shute, ‘shall be excluded from natural trusts? Whatever answer bigotry may suggest, the dictates of candor and

equity, I conceive, will be, None.'"* The Puritan clergyman carried his point and Massachusetts endorsed the Federal Constitution. Most of the State constitutions, however, were not at first characterized by the same perfect liberty. Seven of them debarred Catholics from office or citizenship; six expressly, one by requiring naturalized citizens to abjure any foreign *ecclesiastical* allegiance. Unitarians in one State, Jews and unbelievers in several, were likewise subjected to civil disabilities. But in the course of time all restrictions against adherents of any religion were swept away. The removal of these civil disabilities has always, I believe, been considered a triumph of the American spirit; and the Lutheran and Baptist synods will find it difficult to persuade the public to write the synodical concept of religious liberty and civil equality upon our statute-books. They will not attempt it; but shall we take pride in the removal of such laws from the statute-books and counsel our citizens to engrave them upon their hearts?

That Americans in general do not believe in these synodical principles is shown at every election, when, as Mr. Roosevelt has pointed out, districts predominantly Catholic have repeatedly elected Protestants to office, and, *vice versa*. Catholics have been chosen by several strongly Protestant States as their Chief Magistrates or as their representatives in the Senate. Presidents of the United States have shown no lack of confidence in them, calling them into their cabinet, elevating them to the bench of the Supreme Court, one of whose Chief Justices was a Catholic, and charging them with important posts at home and abroad. Religious issues have sometimes been injected into campaigns, never, however, by Catholics so far as I can recall; but every one has a feeling that it is unfortunate and un-American. It has been done mostly in secret, for its authors were ashamed of the light.

It is a new thing, for the present generation at least, to see the chief authorities of important religious bodies advocating the exclusion of loyal American citizens from office on the sole

* Cobb, "The Rise of Religious Liberty in America," p. 508.

In regard to the persecution directed against Catholics in Colonial times, Mr. Cobb says: "Of all the religious legislation in the Colonies nothing was more absurd than that against Roman Catholics. One would suppose that the Roman Church was a constant and threatening foe to Colonial Institutions. The fact was far otherwise." Pp. 450-451. See also "Maryland, the Land of Sanctuary," by Rev. William Russell.

ground of their religious allegiance. This act will be writ indelibly in the annals of our country in the chapter entitled "Religious Intolerance." And in the same chapter, history ought to record that the action, entirely clerical in origin, received no manifestation of sympathy with its aim or spirit from the laity, who thus earned the blame of their leaders (in things spiritual, but not in politics), and the approbation of the American people.

There must be no tampering with the delicate machinery by which religious liberty and equality are secured, and no fostering of any spirit which would tend to destroy that machinery. Religious passions are deep and strong; and any man in his senses who knows human nature or knows the history of Europe, and has at heart the future peace and happiness of our country, whatever his belief, will do nothing to introduce religious strife into the politics of America. Religious tolerance is not the easy superficial virtue it seems in these placid days; intolerance in the dominating party tends to produce intolerance in the injured party. Then religious peace is near an end, unless strong restraints be used. The spirit of the country has changed much in half a century, and it would be very difficult to arouse such fanaticism as I saw in the Know-nothing days. Prudent men, men who are far-sighted, especially if they are in positions of responsibility, will work for peace and harmony. Such has always been the attitude of our Catholic hierarchy, and, with few exceptions, of our priesthood. I know not what to think of men, putting themselves forward as the leaders of large religious bodies, who counsel the American people to depart from that policy which has promoted peace and good-will among us and made us illustrious among nations for our spirit of liberty and liberality. What good can they hope to accomplish?

They say Catholicism and loyalty are logically incompatible; but if, as they acknowledge, they are felt in fact to be compatible, should they not rejoice? Do they wish to force Catholics to be disloyal? Or do they—ah! perhaps the motive lies here—do they wish to force Catholics to renounce the Pope and become good Protestants? But no, their motive is purely patriotic. Taking Catholicism even at their worst estimate of it, then, should they be willing to introduce into American life all the bitter and hard feeling that a political war on Catholics would certainly precipitate? Willing to incur great and inevitable present evils to ward off a

danger centuries hence that they cannot believe real? Willing to punish henceforth and forever honest good Catholics whom they themselves acknowledge to be loyal Americans, because their descendants of the dim distant future might have an opportunity,—they would not grasp it, confess even these fearful ones,—to overturn American liberties? We may well smile at the shuddering of Major Lusk; but the proposal of these men in this age is inexcusable.

I am speaking in no tone of deprecation. We have nothing to fear for ourselves. We are strong, not only in our own union and strength, but in the broad American spirit of fair play and love of liberty; and, I may be permitted to add, in our confidence that God destines the Catholic Church in this country to be the bulwark of law and order, of liberty, of social justice and purity. But I speak that I may put forth whatever strength I have to crush this detestable spirit of intolerance which, if it gained strength, would wreck the peace of the country and root out charity from the hearts of men. "Let us uncover the hatchet!" shouts an excited Lutheran organ. Brothers, bury it. Far better for you and for the country if when well out of sight of the Fatherland you had silently dropped your hatchet into the deep.

Still, I do not deny, among some men who would oppose political discrimination against Catholics as unjust, unwise and unnecessary, there remains a certain dread of Catholicism. They acknowledge that the Catholic Church in this country is an immense force for the public welfare, raising up native Catholics as patriotic Americans and moulding her foreign-born elements into a homogeneous people. The very sense of her strength, indeed, is in great part the cause of the dread; they fear the danger of a collision between the State and a Church whose head is a foreigner and believes himself the representative of God upon earth. Catholic teaching, American principles of government and the existing facts will show how baseless is this apprehension.

IV.

The distinction between the civil and the ecclesiastical powers is very firmly established in Catholic teaching. "The Almighty," says Pope Leo XIII, "has appointed the charge of the human

race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil; the one being set over divine, the other over human things. Each in its kind is supreme, each has fixed limits within which it is contained, limits which are defined by the nature and special object of the province of each. . . ." "Neither obeys the other within the limits to which each is restricted by its constitution." Pius IX approved a pastoral of the Swiss bishops which teaches the same doctrine, that civil magistrates are "invested in their own domain with a full sovereignty," and that to them "we owe obedience and respect in all things morally permitted and belonging to the domain of civil society." This is but common Catholic doctrine.

The Church, then, holds that the civil government has divine authority, just as has the ecclesiastical; that the limits of each are fixed by the nature of its purpose; that within these limits each power is supreme; consequently, that the Church cannot intermeddle in affairs purely civil, nor the State in affairs purely ecclesiastical; and that members of the Church are bound to obey the State, within its own domain, in all things that do not contravene the moral law.

This distinction of the two spheres or zones of authority, as I may call them, lying in the very nature of their object, remains even if all the members of the State be Catholics. Cardinal Tarquini, a Jesuit writer of authority, states this clearly. "Civil society," he says, "even though every member of it be a Catholic, is not subject to the Church, but plainly independent in temporal things which regard its temporal end. . . . This is proved by reason. For, whatsoever is done in temporal matters, having in view a temporal end, is outside the object of the Church. Now, it is a general rule that no society has power beyond its own scope. . . . Hence it follows that the State, although it be composed of Catholics, yet in temporal matters and from a temporal point of view is by no means subordinate to the Church, but quite independent of her."

The establishing and the maintenance of this distinction is one of the greatest contributions of the Catholic Church to civilization. To us, in the twentieth century, the distinction seems obvious, almost self-evident: but in the ancient world religion was a mere function of the State. To the long struggle of the Papacy during the Middle Ages it is due that Christianity

has not sunk into a Byzantine servitude. Guizot, the Protestant historian and statesman, gives to the Popes the credit for having "proclaimed and maintained the difference between Church and State, the distinction of the two societies, of the two powers, of their respective domains and rights."

That in waging this titanic war the Popes always kept strictly within their legitimate domain and even used their spiritual powers with the gentleness of pastors, Catholic historians are not concerned to maintain; Popes are human, and it is plain from history that some of them did not always act moderately, wisely and in the spirit of Christ. But they had to do with a crude, brutal power which would have enslaved religion; and in a fierce struggle for the life of the Church such mistakes, humanly speaking, were inevitable. Only in defining doctrines for universal belief are the Popes infallible. They have been unflinching in maintaining the independence of a spiritual realm upon earth; and those who are so ready to pardon the mistakes of the great men of history whose work has uplifted humanity ought to be able to find some condonation for the occasional excessive claims of Popes, when it is realized that their efforts alone saved Europe from spiritual bondage.

When the Reformers rejected the authority of the Church the distinction between the two powers was lost to them. The Church of England became subjected to the despotism of Henry VIII. The latest of the long series of humiliations which this connection has thrown on the Church of England is very recent. After maintaining for generations that the law of God forbids a man to marry his deceased wife's sister, and prohibiting her ministers from celebrating such a marriage, she is obliged to retract her ancient discipline because it has pleased Parliament in which sit Atheists and Agnostics to declare such marriages lawful. The State rules the Church. Lutheranism, so bold in its first outburst, became the creature of the civil powers before Luther's death; it remains so to this day. Zwingli handed over religion to the care of the civil powers. Calvin went to the other extreme. He attempted a theocracy, failed, of course, and his religion likewise was committed to the keeping of the State. Every national Protestant Church has been the creature of the State, subject to it in doctrine, ritual, discipline and government. Only the dissenting sects have been able to maintain a certain independence,

and none of them were averse to union with the State which, with Protestantism, has always meant the subjection of the Church to the State.

The history of the schismatical churches of the East repeats the same story. The Patriarchate of Constantinople was first the creature of the Byzantine Emperors and then of the Mohammedan Sultan. The Church of Russia is the servant of the Tsar. The Churches of the Balkan States, each in turn, broke away from the Patriarchs of Constantinople with the cry, "No head but Christ," only to fall under the despotism of the State.

If history points a lesson, then, it shows that the subjection of the religious to the secular has ever followed separation from the Church of Rome. Now it will be objected that if Protestantism leans too much towards subservience to the State, the Catholic Church on the other hand has often acted strongly against the State, especially in the Middle Ages. I grant it, but I hold it was justified by the consent of nations and the public law of that day. Take the England of that period, for example: "As regards national feeling," says the latest and most scientific Protestant historian of the English Reformation,* "the people evidently regarded the cause of the Church as the cause of liberty. That their freedom suffered grievously by the abolition of Papal jurisdiction under Henry VIII there can be no manner of doubt." Again: "That Rome exercised her spiritual power by the willing obedience of Englishmen in general, and that they regarded it as a really wholesome power, even for the control it exercised over secular tyranny, is a fact which it requires no very intimate knowledge of early English literature to bring home to us."† And Gairdner adds that the separation was brought about by the power of a "despotic king" against the will of the people. In other countries too, as the same writer says, the Popes were on the side of liberty and the people against the despotism of the Crown. The Papacy was then universally considered the embodiment of justice and liberty upon the earth. The Hague Tribunal to-day is a very faint image of the political function and power of the mediæval Papacy; and it is but a voice while the Pope was a living power, restraining and civilizing society. "It is impossible," says the Anglican Dean Milman, "to conceive what had been the

* Gairdner, "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," p. 6.

† *Ib.*, p. 5.

confusion, the lawlessness, the chaotic state of the Middle Ages without the mediæval Papacy." In an age of democracy and liberty some gratitude might be expected for the most powerful defender of the people and of liberty; yet the very success of the Papacy in their defence is the ground of the prejudice that exists against it.

V.

The political authority exercised by the mediæval Popes, then, presupposed a united Christendom and was part of the universally recognized international law. Yet, legitimate and beneficial as it was, it was seized upon by the Reformers as one of their chief arguments against the Papacy, and became one of their pretexts for repudiating Rome's spiritual authority. Ever since, the same weapon has been persistently and effectively employed by Protestant writers and divines against the Catholic religion. In consequence there are many persons to-day who, while they are profoundly impressed and attracted by the beauty, the discipline, the deep spiritual influence, efficient moral force of the Catholic Church, yet hesitate to enter simply because of their views regarding the political power claimed by the Pope in the Middle Ages. That power was lost when the unity of Christendom, on the rise of the modern States, ceased to be a fundamental principle of the law of nations; and when Germany, France, Russia, England and America shall be welded into a world-wide confederation on the plan of the Holy Roman Empire, then and not before need statesmen discuss the possibility of a revival of the mediæval Papacy.

Catholics, then, may subscribe to the fundamental article of English Protestantism, "The Pope of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm," if it be understood of the realm of purely temporal affairs; and while we insist that he has the right to the free exercise of his spiritual authority over Catholics, we believe that in civil matters which do not contravene the moral law, we Catholics owe a full and unreserved allegiance to the civil authorities. The same Divine Voice, as I have often preached in the discharge of my pastoral office,* which gives us the command to render

* See, e.g., the sermon on "Obedience to all Lawful Authority" in my Discourses and Sermons on Various Subjects.

unto God the things of God gives us the other command, of equally binding force, to render unto Cæsar the things of Cæsar.

But an objection is repeatedly cast up to Catholics which, repugnant though it is to my inmost feelings of loyalty and reverence towards the Holy Father, I must take into consideration; for utterly impracticable and absurd as it is in our eyes, it seems to haunt the minds of many outside the Church. Suppose, it is said, the Pope were to issue commands in purely civil matters, should not Catholics be bound to yield him obedience? The Pope will take no such act, we know, even though it is not a part of Catholic Faith that he is infallible in the exercise of his authority; but were he to do so he would stand self-condemned, a transgressor of the law he himself promulgates. He would be offending, not only against civil society, but against God and violating an authority as truly from God as his own. Any Catholic who clearly recognized this would not be bound to obey the Pope; or rather his conscience would bind him absolutely to disobey, because with Catholics conscience is the supreme law which under no circumstances can we ever lawfully disobey.

Some controversialists in this country, gruelled for matter of complaint against the Papal dealings with America, have invented the fable that Pius IX recognized the Southern Confederacy. Of course the facts refute them, as the Pope merely extended to Mr. Jefferson Davis the courtesy which one gentleman owes another of addressing him by his official title. They cling to the serviceable fable; and proceed to shudder at the thought of what might have happened if, in the crisis of our Civil War, the President had been a Catholic. Let me relieve them by stating what would have occurred. A Catholic President would act, under the circumstances, precisely as Abraham Lincoln; he would treat the recognition with a respectful silence, and continue to prosecute the war to the best of his ability. If he acted otherwise he would be a traitor to his conscience and his God, to his country and to the Constitution which he had sworn to uphold. And he would have Catholic theological teaching at his back. The Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine says: "In order to resist and defend oneself no authority is required. . . . Therefore, as it is lawful to resist the Pope if he assaulted a man's person, so it is lawful to resist him if he assaulted souls or troubled the State and much more if he strove to destroy the Church. It is lawful, I say, to

resist him, by not doing what he commands and hindering the execution of his will." My venerable and learned predecessor in the See of Baltimore, Archbishop Kenrick, speaks in a similar strain; the Pope's "power was given for edification, not for destruction; if he uses it for love of domination (*quod absit*) scarcely will he meet with obedient populations."

We may put aside, then, as an absurdity the injurious supposition that the Pope would ever interfere in purely civil affairs. But is there not a twilight zone over which both Church and State put forth claims? True; and I grant that here a collision of authorities comes more within the horizon of possibility. But the American concept of government and of liberty puts this hypothesis outside the range of practical affairs. That concept, as I understand it, is that the Government should leave as large a liberty as possible to individuals and to bodies within the State, only intervening in the interests of morality, justice and the common weal. There are forces at work in the country, I know, that tend to paternalism and Cæsarism in Government; but true Americanism recognizes that these forces would bring disaster on American liberties. So long as these liberties, under which we have prospered, are preserved in their fulness, there is, I assert, no danger of a collision between the State and the Catholic Church.

The admission, however, of the merely theoretical possibility of such a collision keeps alive the apprehension of timid Protestants and is sufficient to determine some of them to deprive Catholics forever of the honor of the Presidency. But if no man were to be considered eligible for the Presidency unless we were certain that under no conceivable circumstances would his conscience come into conflict with any possible legislation, then the first consideration to qualify a man as candidate for the office would be that he should have no conscience at all.

"But," many Protestants say, "we obey our conscience, you obey the Pope." Yes; we obey the Pope, for our conscience tells us that we ought to obey the spiritual authority of the Pope in everything except what is sinful. "But," they reply, "we do not believe that any human power should come between the human conscience and duty." Neither do we; but while you believe in private judgment, we believe in a religion of authority which our conscience tells us is our lawful guide and teacher in

its own sphere. You say that you believe in religious freedom. Do you, however, interpret this freedom to apply only to yourselves; or are you willing to conceive that to others likewise is to be left the freedom to follow their consciences? You can conceive a State passing laws that would violate your conscientious convictions. Would you accept these laws, or would you resist them as your fellow religionists in England recently resisted an education law of which they did not approve? I think you would not prove false to your religious convictions. Were the State to attempt to compel Orthodox Jews to accept the Sunday for the Sabbath or to abandon certain Levitical observances which are sacred in their eyes, they would not be worth their salt if they did not resist this encroachment on their rights. Similarly, for example, if the State should forbid us Catholics to continue our parochial schools we should resist to the uttermost; for we hold that, while the State has the undoubted right to compel her future citizens to receive a certain degree of education, she has no right to deprive them of the daily religious influence which we deem necessary for their spiritual and eternal welfare, as well as for their proper training in the duties of citizenship. In any such essay by the State to establish Cæsarism, Catholics would behave precisely as any other conscientious body would behave. They would not think it necessary to await instructions from any source. We believe in the sacredness and supremacy of conscience; and rulers of the world, from Nero to Clemenceau, have found the Catholic conscience to be a wall of adamant.

VI.

It cannot but be regarded as strange that Protestants should feel free to assail the Catholic Church regarding her position on the union of Church and State. Wherever in Europe the opportunity presented itself, the various Protestant Churches united with the State: nay, rather, they threw themselves at the feet of the State and said: "Rule thou over us. Be thou our King and our Prophet." But the Catholic Church has always retained her spiritual independence; her union with the State has always been an alliance of independent powers, not the subjection of a vassal to her liege lord. Her doctrine on the subject has been this: in a country wholly or predominantly Catholic, the most de-

sirable relation is the friendly union and co-operation of Church and State, neither power sacrificing its liberty and each acknowledging the other. That this is the ideal relation, provided liberty be assured to those not of the established church, no sensible man can deny. The Catholic Church states in form of doctrine what all history shows to be inevitable: that where the Church and State are practically two names for the nation viewed as a body of worshippers and as a political entity, it is impossible to prevent an intimate union. If my Protestant friends will show me a free nation that really believes in one religion and has no union of religion with the State I will believe the Catholic doctrine unwarranted. But while the union is ideally best, history assuredly does not prove that it is always practically best. There is a union that is inimical to the interests of religion, and consequently to the State; and there is a separation that is inimical to the interests of religion, and consequently to the State; and there is a separation that is for the best interests of both. In our country separation is a necessity; and it is a separation that works best for the interests of religion, as Mr. Taft recently stated, as well as for the good of the State. I fully agree with him, and I can understand too and sympathize with the great Catholic leader of France, the Count de Mun, who recently exclaimed: "In America separation means the reign of liberty; in France the reign of impiety." American Catholics rejoice in our separation of Church and State; and I can conceive no combination of circumstances likely to arise which should make a union desirable either to Church or State. We know the blessings of our present arrangement; it gives us liberty and binds together priests and people in a union better than that of Church and State. Other countries, other manners; we do not believe our system adapted to all conditions; we leave it to Church and State in other lands to solve their problems for their own best interests. For ourselves, we thank God we live in America, "in this happy country of ours," to quote Mr. Roosevelt, where "religion and liberty are natural allies."

J. CARD. GIBBONS.